

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 35419

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 517
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: June 26, 2009
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
LAYNE KNUT LUND,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Madison County. Hon. Brent J. Moss, District Judge.

Order revoking probation and requiring execution of unified ten-year sentence with three-year determinate term for sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Justin M. Curtis, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge, PERRY, Judge
and GUTIERREZ, Judge

PER CURIAM

Layne Knut Lund was convicted of sexual abuse of a child under the age of sixteen, Idaho Code § 18-1506. The district court imposed a unified ten-year sentence with a three-year determinate term, suspended the sentence and placed Lund on probation. A report of probation violation was filed and the district court revoked Lund's probation, ordered execution of the underlying sentence and retained jurisdiction. At the conclusion of the retained jurisdiction period the district court suspended Lund's sentence and again placed him on probation. Subsequently, Lund admitted to violating several terms of the probation, and the district court consequently revoked probation and ordered execution of the original sentence. Lund appeals,

contending that the district court abused its discretion in revoking probation and that the sentence is excessive.

It is within the trial court's discretion to revoke probation if any of the terms and conditions of the probation have been violated. I.C. §§ 19-2603, 20-222; *State v. Beckett*, 122 Idaho 324, 325, 834 P.2d 326, 327 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Adams*, 115 Idaho 1053, 1054, 772 P.2d 260, 261 (Ct. App. 1989); *State v. Hass*, 114 Idaho 554, 558, 758 P.2d 713, 717 (Ct. App. 1988). In determining whether to revoke probation a court must examine whether the probation is (1) achieving the goal of rehabilitation and (2) consistent with the protection of society. *State v. Upton*, 127 Idaho 274, 275, 899 P.2d 984, 985 (Ct. App. 1995); *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327; *Hass*, 114 Idaho at 558, 758 P.2d at 717. The court may, after a probation violation has been established, order that the suspended sentence be executed or, in the alternative, the court is authorized under Idaho Criminal Rule 35 to reduce the sentence. *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327; *State v. Marks*, 116 Idaho 976, 977, 783 P.2d 315, 316 (Ct. App. 1989). A decision to revoke probation will be disturbed on appeal only upon a showing that the trial court abused its discretion. *Beckett*, 122 Idaho at 325, 834 P.2d at 327.

Sentencing is also a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). When we review a sentence that is ordered into execution following a period of probation, we do not base our review upon only the facts existing when the sentence was imposed. Rather we examine all the circumstances bearing upon the decision to revoke probation and require execution of the sentence, including events that occurred between the original pronouncement of the sentence and the revocation of probation. *Adams*, 115 Idaho at 1055, 772 P.2d at 262; *State v. Grove*, 109 Idaho 372, 373, 707 P.2d 483, 484 (Ct. App. 1985); *State v. Tucker*, 103 Idaho 885, 888, 655 P.2d 92, 95 (Ct. App. 1982).

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion either in revoking probation or in ordering

execution of Lund's original sentence without modification. Therefore, the order revoking probation and directing execution of Lund's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.